arXiv:1401.0618v1 [math.CV] 3 Jan 2014

PSEUDOMEROMORPHIC CURRENTS ON SUBVARIETIES

MATS ANDERSSON

Abstract. Let $i\colon X \to Y$ be pure-dimensional reduced subvariety of a smooth manifold Y. We prove that the direct image of pseudomeromorphic currents on X are pseudomeromorphic on Y. We also prove a partial converse: if $i_*\tau$ is pseudomeromorphic and has the standard extension property, then τ is pseudomermorphic on X.

1. Introduction

Let X be a pure-dimensional analytic space. In [5] was introduced the sheaf $\mathcal{PM}^X$ of pseudomeromorphic currents, and the definition was somewhat further widened in [2]. The principal examples are semi-meromorphic forms and $\bar\partial$ of such forms, as well as direct images under modifications, natural projections, and open inclusions, of such currents.

The interest of this sheaf relies on two facts. To begin with, many currents that occur in multivariable residue theory are pseudomeromorphic; for instance Coleff-Herrera products, [10], the more general Coleff-Herrera currents, [7], Bochner-Martinelli type currents, introduced in [20], and for instance the currents introduced in [1] and [4]. Moreover, pseudomeromorphic currents have some "geometric" properties that are similar to basic properties of positive closed $(*,*)$-currents. For instance, for each analytic subvariety $V \subset X$ and pseudomeromorphic current μ on X, the natural restriction of μ to $X \setminus V$ has a canonical pesudomeromorphic extension $\mathbf{1}_{X\setminus V}\mu$ to X, and

$$\mathbf{1}_V\mu := \mu - \mathbf{1}_{X\setminus V}\mu \tag{1.1}$$

is pseudomeromorphic and has support on V. If V' is another subvariety, then

$$\mathbf{1}_V\mathbf{1}_{V'}\mu = \mathbf{1}_{V\cap V'}\mu. \tag{1.2}$$

Moreover, we have the *dimension principle*, that states that if τ is a pseudomeromorphic $(*,p)$-current with support on an analytic set with codimension larger than p, then τ must vanish. These basic properties very useful or even indispensable tools in, for instance, [5, 3, 2, 6, 17, 18, 19, 21].

If μ is pseudomeromorphic and has support on a pure-dimensional subvariety $V \subset X$ we say that μ has the *standard extension property*, SEP, with respect to V, if $\mathbf{1}_A\mu = 0$ for each subvariety $A \subset V$ of positive codimension. We let $\mathcal{W}_V^X$ denote the sheaf of pseudomeromorphic currents on X with support and the SEP on V.

Assume that $i\colon X \to Y$ is an embedding of a reduced pure-dimensional space X into a smooth manifold Y. Recall that the sheaf of smooth forms on X is defined as the quotient sheaf $\mathscr{E}^X := \mathscr{E}^Y/\operatorname{Ker} i^*$. The image of ξ in $\mathscr{E}^X$ is denoted by $i^*\xi$. By

Date: 2014-01-01.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32A27, 32B15, 32C25, 32C30.

The author was partially supported by a grant from the Swedish Research Council.

definition τ is a current on X, τ in $\mathcal{C}^X$, if it is in the dual of $\mathscr{E}^X$. This means that there is a current μ on Y with support on X such that $\xi\wedge\mu = 0$ for all test forms ξ such that $i^*\xi = 0$, so that $\tau.i^*\xi := \mu.\xi$. It is therefore natural to write $\mu = i_*\tau$. There is an induced $\bar\partial$-operator on forms and currents on X. Here is our main result in this note.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $i\colon X \to Y$ is an embedding of a reduced pure-dimensional space X into a smooth manifold Y.*
(i) If τ is in $\mathcal{PM}^X$, then $i_*\tau$ is in $\mathcal{PM}^Y$, and if τ is in $\mathcal{W}^X$ then $i_*\tau$ is in $\mathcal{W}^Y_X$.
(ii) If τ is in $\mathcal{C}^X$ and $i_*\tau$ is in $\mathcal{PM}^Y$, and in addition,

$$\mathbf{1}_{X_{sing}} i_*\tau = 0, \tag{1.3}$$

then τ is in $\mathcal{PM}^X$. If $i_*\tau$ is in $\mathcal{W}^Y_X$, then τ is in $\mathcal{W}^X$.

That is, we have the natural mappings

$$i_*\colon \mathcal{PM}^X \to \mathcal{PM}^Y, \quad i_*\colon \mathcal{W}^X \to \mathcal{W}^Y_X.$$

Notice that the condition (1.3) in (ii) is automatically fulfilled if $i_*\tau$ is in $\mathcal{W}^Y_X$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 relies very much on the existence of a so-called strong desingularization, see below. However we also need the following result which is interesting in itself.

Proposition 1.2. *If $p\colon X' \to X$ is a modification and X' is smooth, then*

$$p_*\colon \mathcal{PM}(X') \to \mathcal{PM}(X)$$

is surjective.

2. Pseudomeromorphic currents

Recall that in one complex variable t one can define the *principal value current* $1/t^m$, $m \ge 1$, as the value at $\lambda = 0$ of the analytic continuation of $|t|^{2\lambda}/t^m$, a priori defined when $\operatorname{Re}\lambda \gg 0$. The *residue current* $\bar\partial(1/t^m)$ is the value at $\lambda = 0$ of $\bar\partial|t|^{2\lambda}/t^m$; clearly it has support at $t = 0$.

Assume now that t_j are holomorphic coordinates in an open set $U \subset \mathbb{C}^N$. Since we can take tensor products of one-variable currents, we can form the current

$$\tau = \bar\partial\frac{1}{t_1^{a_1}}\wedge\cdots\wedge\bar\partial\frac{1}{t_r^{a_r}}\wedge\frac{\alpha(t)}{t_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}}\cdots t_N^{a_N}}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $a_1,\dots,a_r$ are positive integers, $a_{r+1},\dots,a_N$ are nonnegative integers, and γ is a smooth form with compact support in U. Such a τ is called an *elementary (pseudomeromorphic) current* in U. It is commuting in the principal value factors and anti-commuting in the residue factors.

Fix a point $x \in X$. We say that a germ μ of a current at x is *pseudomeromorphic* at x, $\mu \in \mathcal{PM}_x$, if it is a finite sum of currents of the form $\pi_*\tau = \pi^1_*\cdots\pi^m_*\tau$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is a neighborhood of x,

$$\mathcal{U}^m \xrightarrow{\pi^m} \cdots \xrightarrow{\pi^2} \mathcal{U}^1 \xrightarrow{\pi^1} \mathcal{U}^0 = \mathcal{U}, \tag{2.2}$$

each $\pi^j\colon \mathcal{U}^j \to \mathcal{U}^{j-1}$ is either a modification, a simple projection $\mathcal{U}^{j-1}\times Z \to \mathcal{U}^{j-1}$, or an open inclusion (i.e., $\mathcal{U}^j$ is an open subset of $\mathcal{U}^{j-1}$), and τ is elementary on $\mathcal{U}^m$.

By definition the union $\mathcal{PM} = \cup_x \mathcal{PM}_x$ is an open subset of the sheaf $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^X$ and hence it is a subsheaf, the sheaf of *pseudomeromorphic* currents, of $\mathcal{C}$. A section μ of $\mathcal{PM}$ over an open set $\mathcal{V} \subset X$, $\mu \in \mathcal{PM}(\mathcal{V})$, is then a locally finite sum

$$\mu = \sum (\pi_\ell)_* \tau_\ell, \tag{2.3}$$

where each π_ℓ is a composition of mappings as in (2.2) (with $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{V}$) and τ_ℓ is elementary. The definition here is from [2] and it is in turn a slight elaboration of the definition introduced in [5].

If ξ is a smooth form, then $\xi \wedge \pi_* \tau = \pi_* \big(\pi^* \xi \wedge \tau\big)$. Thus $\mathcal{PM}$ is closed under exterior multiplication by smooth forms. Notice that if τ is an elementary current, then $\bar\partial \tau$ is a finite sum of elementary currents. Since moreover $\bar\partial$ commutes with push-forwards it follows that $\mathcal{PM}$ is closed under $\bar\partial$.

Assume that μ is pseudomeromorphic and V is a subvariety. Let h be a tuple of holomorphic functions such that the common zero set is precisely V. The function $\lambda \mapsto |h|^{2\lambda}\mu$ (a priori defined for $\operatorname{Re}\lambda \gg 0$) has a current-valued analytic continuation to $\operatorname{Re}\lambda > -\epsilon$. The value at $\lambda = 0$ is precisely the pseudomeromorphic current $\mathbf{1}_{X\setminus V}\mu$ mentioned above, and we write

$$\mathbf{1}_{X\setminus V}\mu = |h|^{2\lambda}\mu|_{\lambda=0}. \tag{2.4}$$

One can also obtain $\mathbf{1}_{X\setminus V}\mu$ as a principal value: If χ is a smooth approximand of the characteristic function of $[1,\infty)$ on $\mathbb{R}$, then

$$\mathbf{1}_{X\setminus V}\mu = \lim_{\delta\to 0^+} \chi(|h|/\delta)\mu. \tag{2.5}$$

Notice that $\mathbf{1}_V \mu = \mu$ if μ has support on V, cf., (1.1). The existence of (2.4) and the independence of h follow from the corresponding statements for elementary currents, noting that if $\mu = \pi_*\tau$, then $|h|^{2\lambda}\mu = \pi_*(|\pi^* h|^{2\lambda}\tau)$ for $\operatorname{Re}\lambda \gg 0$. In the same way one can reduce the verification of (2.5) to the case with elementary currents. Notice that if p is a modification or simple projection, then, cf., (2.4),

$$\xi \wedge p_*\tau = p_*(p^*\xi \wedge \tau), \quad \mathbf{1}_V p_*\tau = p_*\big(\mathbf{1}_{p^{-1}V}\tau\big). \tag{2.6}$$

If τ is pseudomeromorphic and has support on V, and h is a holomorphic function that vanishes on V, then $\bar h \tau = 0$ and $d\bar h \wedge \tau = 0$, see [5, 2]. This intuitively means that the current τ only involves holomorphic derivatives of test forms.

3. Proofs

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that τ is an elementary current of the form (2.1). Let $t^b = t_1^{b_1}\cdots t_r^{b_r}$ be a monomial and γ a strictly positive smooth function. Then*

$$\frac{|t^b|^{2\lambda}\gamma^\lambda}{t^b}\tau, \quad \frac{\bar\partial\big(|t^b|^{2\lambda}\gamma^\lambda\big)}{t^b}\wedge\tau,$$

both have analytic continuation to $Re\,\lambda > -\epsilon$, and the values at $\lambda = 0$ are elementary pseudomeromorphic currents that are independent of γ,

Proof. First assume that $\gamma = 1$. Then the lemma is basically a one-variable statement, and follows from the observation that

$$\lambda \mapsto \frac{|t^b|^{2\lambda}}{t^b}\frac{\alpha}{t^m}, \quad \lambda \mapsto \frac{\bar\partial|t^b|^{2\lambda}}{t^b}\wedge\frac{\alpha}{t^m},$$

admit the desired analytic continuations, and that the values at $\lambda = 0$ are the currents α/t^{m+b} and $\bar\partial(1/t^{m+b})\wedge\alpha$, respectively, together with the trivial fact that

$$\lambda \mapsto \frac{|t^b|^{2\lambda}}{t^b}\alpha\wedge\bar\partial\frac{1}{t^m} = 0, \quad \lambda \mapsto \frac{\bar\partial|t^b|^{2\lambda}}{t^b}\wedge\alpha\wedge\bar\partial\frac{1}{t^m} = 0,$$

when $\operatorname{Re}\lambda \gg 0$.

When γ is just strictly positive we introduce the complex parameter μ and notice that

$$\lambda,\mu \mapsto \frac{|t^b|^{2\lambda}\gamma^\mu}{t^b}\tau, \quad \lambda,\mu \mapsto \frac{\bar\partial|t^b|^{2\lambda}\gamma^\mu}{t^b}\wedge\tau,$$

are analytic for $(\lambda,\mu) \in \{\operatorname{Re}\lambda > -\epsilon\}\times\mathbb{C}$. Thus the value at $\lambda = \mu = 0$ can be obtained by first letting $\mu = 0$ and then $\lambda = 0$, and so we are back to the case when $\gamma = 1$. □

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $p\colon Y \to X \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is a modification or a simple projection and τ is an elementary pseudomeromorphic current in X (with respect to the standard coordinates in $\mathbb{C}^n$). Then there is a modification $\tilde p\colon \widetilde Y \to Y$ such that*

$$\tau = p_*\tilde p_*\sum_\ell \tau_\ell,$$

where the sum is finite and each τ_ℓ is elementary with respect to some local coordinates in $\widetilde Y$.

Proof. Let us first assume that p is a modification and that τ is elementary with respect to the coordinates t_j in X, say of the form (2.1). Notice that p^*t_j are global holomorphic functions in Y. There is a smooth modification $\tilde p\colon \widetilde Y \to Y$ and an open cover $\mathcal{U}_\ell$ of $\tilde Y$ such that, for each ℓ, all the functions $\tilde p^*p^*t_j$ are monomials (with respect to the same local coordinates s) times a nonvanishing holomorphic factor in $\mathcal{U}_\ell$. Take a partition of unity χ_ℓ subordinate to $\mathcal{U}_\ell$. If

$$\tau^\lambda := \tau^{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_N} := \frac{\bar\partial|t_1|^{2\lambda_1}}{t_1^{a_1}}\wedge\dots\wedge\frac{\bar\partial|t_r|^{2\lambda_r}}{t_r^{a_r}}\wedge\alpha\frac{|t_{r+1}|^{2\lambda_{r+1}}}{t_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}}}\cdots\frac{|t_N|^{2\lambda_N}}{t_N^{a_N}},$$

where $N \le n$, then

$$\tau = \tau^{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_N}|_{\lambda_N=0}\cdots|_{\lambda_1=0}.$$

Let $\pi = \tilde p\circ p$. For $\lambda \gg 0$ we have that

$$\pi^*\tau^\lambda = \sum_\ell \chi_\ell\pi^*\tau^\lambda.$$

By repeated applications of Lemma 3.1 it follows, for each ℓ, that

$$\chi_\ell\pi^*\tau^\lambda|_{\lambda_N=0}\cdots|_{\lambda_1=0} \tag{3.1}$$

exists and is a finite sum $\tilde\tau_\ell$ of elementary currents in $\mathcal{U}_\ell$. Since $\tau^\lambda = \pi_*\pi^*\tau^\lambda$ when $\operatorname{Re}\lambda \gg 0$, we conclude that

$$\tau = \pi_*\sum_\ell \tilde\tau_\ell = p_*\tilde p_*\sum_\ell\tilde\tau_\ell.$$

If p is a simple projection $X\times X' \to X$, we can take any test form χ in X' with total integral 1. Then the tensor product $\tau\otimes\chi$ is en elementary current in $X\times X'$ such that $p_*(\tau\otimes\chi) = \tau$. □

The order that we let λ_j be 0 in the proof is arbitrary. However, the single terms $\tilde{\tau}_\ell$ in $\tilde{Y}$, as well as the resulting current $\tilde{p}\tau$, will depend on the order.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. Assume that $\mu = \pi_*\tau$, where π is a composed mapping as in (2.2) and τ is elementary in $\mathcal{U}_m$. It is enough to see that $\mu = p_*\mu'$ for some $\mu' \in \mathcal{PM}(\mathcal{V})$ where $\mathcal{V} = p^{-1}\mathcal{U}$. The proposition then follows since a general global section for a locally finite sum och such μ since p is proper.

We claim that (2.2) can be extended to a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} \widetilde{\mathcal{V}} & = & \mathcal{V}_m & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_m} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_2} & \mathcal{V}_1 & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_1} & \mathcal{V}_0 & = & \mathcal{V} \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p_m} & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p} & & \\ \widetilde{U} & = & \mathcal{U}_m & \xrightarrow{\pi_m} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & \mathcal{U}_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi^1} & \mathcal{U}_0 & = & \mathcal{U} \end{array} \tag{3.2}$$

so that each vertical map is a modification and each $\tilde{\pi}_j$ is either a modification, a simple projection, or an open inclusion, cf., the proof of Proposition 2.7 in [2]. To see this, assume that this is done up to level k. It is well-known that if $\pi_{k+1}\colon \mathcal{U}_{k+1} \to \mathcal{U}_k$ is a modification, then there are modifications $\tilde{\pi}_{k+1}\colon \mathcal{V}_{k+1} \to \mathcal{V}_k$ and $p_{k+1}\colon \mathcal{V}_{k+1} \to \mathcal{U}_{k+1}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_{k+1}} & \mathcal{V}_k \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle p_{k+1}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p_k} \\ \mathcal{U}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\pi^{k+1}} & \mathcal{U}_k \end{array}$$

commutes. If instead $\mathcal{U}_{k+1} = \mathcal{U}_k \times Z$ then we simply take $\mathcal{V}_{k+1} = \mathcal{V}_k \times Z$. Finally, if $i\colon \mathcal{U}_{k+1} \to \mathcal{U}_k$ is an open inclusion, then we take $\mathcal{V}_{k+1} = p_k^{-1}\mathcal{U}_{k+1}$.

By Lemma 3.2 there is a pseudomeromorphic current $\tilde{\tau}$ with compact support in $\mathcal{V}_m$ such that $p_m\tilde{\tau} = \tau$. If $\tilde{\pi}$ is the composed mapping in the upper line, it follows that $\mu' = \tilde{\pi}_*\tilde{\tau}$ is pseudomeromorphic in $\mathcal{V}$ such that $p_*\mu' = \mu$.

□

Lemma 3.3. *If $\mu \in \mathcal{PM}(X)$ and $\mu' \in \mathcal{PM}(X')$, then $\tau \otimes \tau' \in \mathcal{PM}(X \times X')$.*

Proof. It is enough to consider the case $\mu = \pi_*\tau$, $\mu' = \pi'_*\tau'$, where τ, τ' are elementary, and π, π' are compositions of mappings as in (2.2). However, it is easily verified that then

$$\pi \otimes \pi'\colon \mathcal{U}_m \times \mathcal{U}_{m'} \to \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}' \subset X \times X'$$

is again a composition of modifications, simple projections, and open inclusions. Since $\mu \otimes \mu' = (\pi \otimes \pi')_*\tau \otimes \tau'$ it is pseudomeromorphic by definition. □

As already mentioned the proof of Theorem 1.1 relies on the existence of a *strong desingularization*, see, e.g., [9] and the refererences given there. This means that there is a smooth modification $p\colon \widetilde{Y} \to Y$ that is a biholomorphism outside X_{sing} and such that the strict transform $\widetilde{X}$ of X is a smooth submanifold of $\widetilde{Y}$ and the restriction p' of p to $\widetilde{X}$ is a modification $p'\colon \widetilde{X} \to X$ of X. Thus we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{X} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{i}} & \widetilde{Y} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle p'} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p} \\ X & \xrightarrow{i} & Y \end{array} \quad . \tag{3.3}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First assume that X is a smooth submanifold. The statement (i) is local so we may assume that $Y = X_z \times \mathbb{C}^r$ and $i(z) = (z, 0)$. It is easily checked that $i_*\tau$ is equal to the tensor product

$$\mu := \tau \wedge [w = 0] \tag{3.4}$$

where $[w = 0]$ means the point evalutation at $0 \in \mathbb{C}^r$. In view of Lemma 3.3 it is then pseudomeromorphic since $[w = 0] = \bar\partial \frac{1}{w} \wedge dw(2\pi i)^{-r}$ is. For a test form $\xi = \xi(z, w)$, we can write $\xi = \xi' + \xi''$, where ξ' contains no occurrences of dw_j or $d\bar w_j$. Then

$$i_*\tau.\xi = \tau.i^*\xi = \tau.i^*\xi' = \tau.\xi'(\cdot, 0) = \mu.\xi,$$

cf., (3.4), and hence $i_*\tau = \mu$ is pseudomeromorphic in Y. Now assume that $i\colon X \to Y$ is arbitrary and consider (3.3). Any $\tau \in \mathcal{PM}(X)$ can be written $p'_*\tilde\tau$ for some $\tilde\tau \in \mathcal{PM}(\widetilde X)$ according to Proposition 1.2. By the first part we now that $\tilde i_*\tilde\tau$ is pseudomeromorphic in $\widetilde Y$. Thus $i_*\tau = i_*p'_*\tilde\tau = p_*\tilde i_*\tilde\tau$ is pseudomeromorphic in Y, and so the first part of (i) is proved.

Assume that $V \subset X$ has positive codimension. Since $i^{-1}V = V$ we have, cf., (2.6), that $\mathbf{1}_V i_*\tau = i_*\mathbf{1}_V\tau$. Thus $i_*\tau$ is in $\mathcal{W}^Y_X$ if (and only if) τ is in $\mathcal{W}^X$, and so the second part of (i) follows.

We now consider (ii). Again assume first that X is smooth. Again the statement is local so we may assume that $Y = X_z \times \mathbb{C}^r_w$. Let $\pi\colon Y \to X_z$ be the projection $(z, w) \mapsto z$. Since $i_*\tau$ is pseudomeromorphic by assumption also $p_*i_*\tau$ is pseudomeromorphic. Now,

$$p_*i_*\tau.i^*\xi = i_*\tau.p^*i^*\xi = i_*\tau.\xi'(\cdot, 0) = \tau.i^*\xi,$$

for all test forms ξ, and hence $p_*i_*\tau$. We conclude that τ is in $\mathcal{PM}^X$. Thus (ii) holds in case $X \subset Y$ is smooth.

Now assume that $i\colon X \to Y$ is general, $\mu := i_*\tau \in \mathcal{PM}(Y)$, and consider (3.3). We claim that $\mu = p_*\tilde\mu$, where $\tilde\mu \in \mathcal{PM}(\widetilde Y)$, $\tilde\mu$ has support on $\widetilde X$, and $\mathbf{1}_{p^{-1}X_{sing}}\tilde\mu = 0$. To begin with $\mu = p_*\hat\mu$ for some $\hat\mu \in \mathcal{PM}(\widetilde Y)$ according to Proposition 1.2. Since

$$0 = \mathbf{1}_{Y\setminus X}p_*\hat\mu = p_*(\mathbf{1}_{\widetilde Y\setminus p^{-1}X}\hat\mu),$$

cf., (2.6), we have that $\mu = p_*\mu'$ where $\mu' := \mathbf{1}_{p^{-1}X}\hat\mu$ has support on $p^{-1}X$. Notice that this set is in general much larger than the strict transform $\widetilde X$ of X. Now

$$\mu' = \mathbf{1}_{p^{-1}X_{sing}}\mu' + \mathbf{1}_{p^{-1}(X\setminus X_{sing})}\mu'$$

and, by assumption (1.3), $0 = \mathbf{1}_{X_{sing}}\mu = p_*\mathbf{1}_{p^{-1}X_{sing}}\mu'$, and thus $\mu = p_*\tilde\mu$ where

$$\tilde\mu := \mathbf{1}_{p^{-1}(X\setminus X_{sing})}\mu'$$

has support on the closure of $p^{-1}(X \setminus X_{sing})$ which is (contained in) $\widetilde X$. Thus the claim is proved.

Next we claim that $\tilde\mu = \tilde i_*\tilde\tau$ for a current $\tilde\tau$ on $\widetilde X$. In fact, let ξ is a test form on $\widetilde Y$ such that $\tilde i^*\xi = 0$. Since p is a biholomorphism outside $p^{-1}X_{sing}$, $\xi\wedge\tilde\mu = 0$ there since $\mu = i_*\tau$ there. Since $\tilde\mu$ has support on $\widetilde X$ it follows that $\xi\wedge\tilde\mu = 0$ outside $\widetilde X \cap p^{-1}X_{sing}$, and hence $\xi\wedge\tilde\mu = 0$ by continuity. Thus the claim follows.

From the smooth case we know that $\tilde\tau$ is pseudomeromorphic and therefore $p'_*\tilde\tau$ is pseudomeromorphic as well. Finally, $i_*p'_*\tilde\tau = p_*\tilde i_*\tilde\tau = p_*\tilde\mu = \mu = i_*\tau$ and thus $p'_*\tilde\tau = \tau$. Thus τ is pseudomeromorphic. The second part of (ii) is verified as the second part of (i). □

References

[1] M. Andersson *Residue currents and ideals of holomorphic functions Bull. Sci. Math.*, **128**, (2004), 481–512

[2] M. Andersson, H. Samuelsson: A Dolbeault-Grothendieck lemma on complex spaces via Koppelman formulas. *Invent. Math.* **190** (2012), 261–297.

[3] M. Andersson, H. Samuelsson, J. Sznajdman: On the Briançon-Skoda theorem on a singular variety. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, **60(2)** (2010), 417–432.

[4] M. Andersson, E. Wulcan: Residue currents with prescribed annihilator ideals. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, **40** (2007), 985–1007.

[5] M. Andersson, E. Wulcan: Decomposition of residue currents. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **638** (2010), 103–118.

[6] M. Andersson, E. Wulcan: On the effective membership problem on singular varieties. *arXiv:1107.0388*.

[7] J-E. Björk:*Residue currents and $\mathscr{D}$-modules on complex manifolds* Preprint Stockholm (1996)

[8] J-E. Björk, H. Samuelsson: *Regularizations of residue currents. J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **640** (2010), 101–115.

[9] Bravo, Ana María; Encinas, Santiago; Villamayor U., Orlando: *A simplified proof of desingularization and applications. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **21** (2005), 349–458.

[10] Coleff, N.; Herrera, M. *Les courants résiduels associés à une forme méromorphe. (French) [The residue currents associated with a meromorphic form] Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **633**. Springer, Berlin, 1978. x+211 pp.

[11] J.-P. Demailly: Complex analytic and algebraic geometry. *Monograph*, Grenoble. Available at `http://www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/books.html`.

[12] K. Diederich, J. E. Fornæss, S. Vassiliadou: Local L^2 results for $\bar{\partial}$ on a singular surface. *Math. Scand.*, **92** (2003), 269–294.

[13] D. Eisenbud: Commutative algebra. With a view toward algebraic geometry. *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, **150**. Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1995.

[14] G. Henkin, M. Passare: Abelian differentials on singular varieties and variations on a theorem of Lie-Griffiths. *Invent. Math.*, **135(2)** (1999), 297–328.

[15] G. Henkin, P. Polyakov: The Grothendieck-Dolbeault lemma for complete intersections. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér I Math*, **308(13)** (1989), 405–409.

[16] G. Henkin, P. Polyakov: Residual d-bar-cohomology and the complex Radon transform on subvarieties of CPn. *Math. Ann.*, **354**(2012), 497–527.

[17] R. Lärkäng: *Residue currents associated with weakly holomorphic functions. Ark. Mat.* **50** (2012), 135–164.

[18] R. Lärkäng: *On the duality theorem on an analytic variety. Math. Ann.* **355** (2013), no. 1, 215–234. 32C30 (32A27)

[19] J. Lundqvist *An effective uniform Artin-Rees lemma. arXiv:1306.5956*

[20] M. Passare & A. Tsikh & A. Yger *Residue currents of the Bochner-Martinelli type Publ. Mat.* **44** (2000), 85–117.

[21] J. Sznajdman *A residue calculus approach to the uniform Artin-Rees lemma. Israel J. Math.* **196** (2013), no. 1, 33–50.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Division of Mathematics, University of Gothenburg and Chalmers University of Technology, SE-412 96 Göteborg, Sweden

E-mail address: `matsa@chalmers.se, larkang@chalmers.se`